

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 were examined by the Office, and claims 1, 3-13 and 15-18 are rejected and claims 2 and 14 are objected to. With this response claims 1-10 and 17-18 are amended, and new claims 19-20 are added. All amendments and new claims are fully supported by the specification as originally filed. The claims are amended to remove "step" language, and to remove acronyms. Support for the amendments to claims 17 and 18 and new claim 20 can be found at least from Figure 4 and the accompanying text of the specification.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in light of the following discussion.

**Claim Rejections Under § 103**

In section 2, on page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1, 3-7, 10-13 and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Beckmann et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,999,753) in view of Toskala et al. (U.S. Appl. Publ. No. 2001/0008838). Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, because Beckmann is not a valid prior art reference.

The present application is the U.S. National Phase of International Application No. PCT/EP02/00047, which was filed January 4, 2002. Beckmann resulted from International Application No. PCT/EP02/08735, which was filed August 5, 2002. This date is after the priority date of the present application, and therefore Beckmann is not prior art. Furthermore, while the cover page of Beckmann states that the PCT publication date was May 3, 2001, this date and the PCT publication number listed on the cover page do not correspond to the International Application for Beckmann. Instead, the proper PCT publication number for Beckmann is WO03/015440, which was published February 20, 2003 in German. Therefore, Beckmann is not prior art with respect to the present application, because its earliest effective date is after the international filing date of the present application. As such, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections to the claims.

Furthermore, applicant respectfully submits that Toskala does not disclose or suggest at least the independent claims of the present application. In contrast to the claims of the present application, Toskala is directed to allowing a mobile communication device to receive only one burst for obtaining both desired pieces of information by decoding the PICH bits to find out if a

paging message is to be received, and measuring the reception level of the midamble of the PICH burst for determining the quality of the radio connection. See Toskala paragraph [0016]. Claim 1 for example recites, including a high-speed indicator designating a specific mobile terminal device accessible in a downlink channel to the slot structure of a paging indicator channel. This limitation is not disclosed or suggested by Toskala, and therefore Toskala alone cannot disclose or suggest the limitations recited in the claims of the present application.

In section 3, on page 4 of the Office Action, claims 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Beckmann in view of Toskala, and further in view of Li (U.S. Appl. Publ. No. 2002/0077087). For at least the reasons discussed above, Beckmann is not available as a reference, and applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections to the claims.

In addition, Li also fails to disclose or suggest all of the limitations of at least the independent claims. Li is directed to solving point-to-multipoint multicast (PTM-M) problem by adding a PTM-M group identifier to paging information in order to realize PTM-M. However, the present invention as recited in claim 1 for example include a high-speed indicator designating a specific mobile terminal device accessible in a downlink channel to the slot structure of a paging indicator channel, which is not disclosed or suggested by Li.

#### **Allowable Subject Matter**

In section 4, on page 5 of the Office Action, claims 2 and 14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claims, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant acknowledges that claims 2 and 14 are indicated to be allowable, but does not wish to amend these claims into independent form at this time, because the independent claims from which these claims depend are believed to be allowable.

Conclusion

The rejections of the Office Action having been shown to be inapplicable, withdrawal thereof is requested, and passage to issue of the present application is earnestly solicited. The undersigned hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge Deposit Account No. 23-0442 for any fee deficiency required to submit this response.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 20 August 2007

Keith R. Obert

Keith R. Obert  
Attorney for the Applicant  
Registration No. 58,051

KRO/kas  
WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS  
& ADOLPHSON LLP  
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224  
Monroe, CT 06468  
Telephone: (203) 261-1234  
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676  
Customer No. 004955